

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Fatent and Trademark Office Notices COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS 8.0 Bea 1451 Alexandra Vocasus 22311-1459

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,684	04/10/2001	Steffen Hofseker	Mo-6019/LeA33,933	9248
157 755	06/01/2004		EXAM	INER
BAYER POLY			ARMED, SHEEBA	
100 BAYER RC PITTSBURGH.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. 09/829 684	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sheeba Ahmed	1773	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance: (2) a timely filed Notice of A	d to avoid abandonment of this er; (1) a timely filed amendme	application. A proper reply to nt which places the application	oa min

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) 🔯	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) 🗌	The period for repty expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.	In
	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
	ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 07/II.	
Exto	roles of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,138(a) and the appropriate extension	
	been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension	

(2) as set furth in (b) shows if checked. Any poly received by the Office later than three months after the making date of the final rejection, even if

timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below):

(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment

canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the

application in condition for allowance because: See etteched sheet. 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. □ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) □ will not be entered or b) □ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 15,18,19 and 22-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ___

10. Other:

 The Response After Final submitted on May 5, 2004 has been entered in the above-identified application however does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 15, 18, 19, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (US 6,319,594 B1) and submit that Suzuki does not disclose zinc oxide particles and rather teaches zinc oxide/aluminum oxide particles. The Applicants argue that Suzuki does not meet the limitations of the instantly claimed invention given that zinc oxide/aluminum oxide is a composite material wherein the aluminum oxide can not be removed and further given that the instant application claims ".... a zinc oxide coating, wherein the coating consists essentially of zinc oxide nanoparticles...". However, the Examiner disagrees. The transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps "and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)" of the claimed invention. In re Herz. 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976). A consisting essentially of claim occupies a middle ground between closed claims that are written in a consisting of format and fully open claims that are drafted in a comprising format." PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries, 156 F.3d 1351, 1354, 48 USPQ2d 1351, 1353-54 (Fed. Cir. 1998). See also Atlas Powder v. E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co., 750 F.2d 1569,224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984): In re Janakirama-Rao, 317 F.2d 951, 137 USPO 893 (CCPA 1963); Water Technologies Corp. vs. Calco. Ltd., 850 F.2d 660, 7 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the

specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are,
"consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g.,
PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355. In this case, the recitation ".... a zinc
oxide coating, wherein the coating consists essentially of zinc oxide nanoparticles..." is
interpreted as an open claim (since there is no clear indication in the specification or
claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are) and therefore the zinc
oxide/aluminum oxide material taught by Suzuki meets the limitations of the above
recited claim language. The Examiner would like to again point out that the issue here
is not whether there is any suggestion or motivation in Suzuki to use fine particles of the
sputtering materials to replace the fine particles in the liquid coating but whether the
zinc oxide/aluminum oxide particles taught by Suzuki meet the limitation "... a zinc
oxide coating, wherein the coating consists essentially of zinc oxide nanoparticles...".
The Examiner maintains that all limitations have been met.

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheeba Ahmed whose telephone number is (571)272-1504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on (571)272-1516. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toil-free).

Sheeba Ahmed Art Unit 1773 May 24, 2004